

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/657,457	WALLACE, RAYMOND CURTIS
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Yuriy Semenenko	2841

**All Participants:**

(1) Yuriy Semenenko.

Y S

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Kathleen L. Connell (reg. No: 45344).

(2) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 19 September 2006

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See next page.*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Examiner noted that product claims may have been allowable but this determination require further amendments and further consideration including consideration of rejoinder. Examiner called applicant to see if he would be willing to amend the claims including the method claims so they could be rejoined if the product claim were allowed. Applicant gave a positive indication on the phone. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given by applicant's representative.